

3/3/2011  
M. SILVA

**Cedar Valley Pumpers (09) Primary Assessment = GW pumpers**

Assessment Method: Variable – based upon previous year's ac.ft. use.

Minimum assessment \$5.00

No water used, no assessment.

This system is responsible for **42%** of the total Cedar Valley assessment.

Since pump meters were not operable the AF amounts are based on WR or last know amount in AF used

**Cedar Valley Surface (10) Secondary Assessment = Surface Diverters**

Assessment Method: Variable – based upon previous year's ac. ft. use.

Minimum assessment \$5.00

No water used, no assessment.

This system is responsible for **58%** of the total Cedar Valley assessment.

These amounts are measured and entered into the Diversion Spreadsheets and numbers should be entered by the WC to the Roster each year.

The Northfield and East Extension Diversion amounts used to be a combined amount because of the measurement method and they must be split 50/50 to arrive at the corresponding diversion amounts for the assessment. Sam has been turning this amount in already separated for the readings starting in 2010, so the amounts shown for these go directly into the secondary assessment column without any changes.

Most of the changes in the units that need to be entered into the Assessment database occur in the Secondary assessment number column and rely on the water commissioners readings. The remainder of the amounts is based on best information available or on Water Right AF numbers, typically these numbers don't change. The WC fills out the secondary units in the roster where changes are needed.

In 2011, there were 38 accounts (all pumpers) that had not been billed for 10-20 years showing 0 in both Primary and Secondary. These accounts were made inactive for the 2011 assessment mailing. Other accounts not receiving mail and on the delinquent were also made inactive. .

In 2010 Sam Bauer, Water Commissioner started entering data directly to the Station Pages on the Water Rights website therefore the surface (secondary Units) diversion amounts can be determined from that information. Note that the 2010 report contained screen prints, not PDF prints so the pages needed to be reprinted to show the total AF amounts, this was the copy was replaced into the report record since it provides a cleaner copy. In 2011 Sam was able to accomplish the PDF prints and fill out the Roster where changes were needed. Also note that since the diversion structure has not been able to capture the water much of it runs down coal creek and they get the much higher assessment that was seen in 2011. A notable increase of +1461 See table below:

Account	2010 Asmt	2011 Assmt	Diff + or -
Cedar City Corp	1622	760	-862
Union Field	727	467	-260
East Extension	624	368	-256
North Field Irr Co	624	370	-254
Coal Creek	605	2066	+1461
South & West	294	386	+92
Northwest Field	250	466	+216
Enoch	189	88	-101
Old Fort	188	169	-19

#### Older Assessment Notes:

In 2010 the data records were incomplete, as follows

---Specifically Cedar city corp. showed 14.28AF- compared to 6142 the year before so we used last years data

---Enoch city- No data, previous year was 715. Again we used last year data

---Coal creek showed 327 and year before it was 2439? Use last years data

---South and Westfield data was checked, last year it was 1296AF and in 2010 it showed 2225.45AF ( about twice the usual). *So that amount may need to be split*

After discussing this with the Sam Bauer, Water Commissioner:

...Old Fort and North Field star in Mid March each year , they split the flow. Usually

>>Northfield flow range from 15 to 40 CFS and runs all Irrigation season.

>>Old Fort runs 15-24 CFS and ends May 31

...Union starts in April runs all irrigation season

...Bulldog starts in April ends May 31

...Southwest starts in Mid April runs all irrigation season

...Coal creek starts in Mid April ends may 31

**Acct. 100567 Pacific Corp. is fixed at 30% of the surface share of the**

**assessment not to exceed \$360.00.** This account was made inactive since the power company no longer operates a Hydro plant in the canyon. (Lee Sim) Apparently this plant has been out of service for quite a few years and was still being billed until Pacific corp pointed this out.

**Mike's Notes (3-30-2009)**

The Assessment database automatically accounts for the 42/58% split between the pumpers/surface diversions. Which is also the difference between the Surface (secondary units) and the Primary (groundwater pumpers) units, this split was established long ago when the system was first set up and was being assessed. It also totals the number of units for all the accounts combined. The WC measures the surface diversions, but has not measured the GW diversions since before 2005, there is no reliable measurement on the Pumpers. The WC recommends changes to the Account roster and completes the diversion amounts for the surface diverters. Lately he has recommended changes to the accounts by making some inactive and consolidating multiple accounts under the same name to one account. He is also good about providing new ownership information when it's available.

Recent discussion about dropping the pumpers from the assessments creates a reliance on the surface diverters for funding the entire Budget. However it is only the surface diverters attending the meetings for the most part and they continue to want the pumpers subsidize their portion of the budget, even though the pumpers aren't actively regulated by the WC.

In the 2010 annual meeting the Surface diverters again are the ones that show up and want continue to enjoy the subsidy provided by the pumpers

To reconcile the pumpers and bring the data into a more accurate/current accounting, each individual account needs be metered or at least a current acreage measurement obtained. Mapping is preferred however this is a large project similar to recent efforts on Parowan, and more mature mapped systems such as Beryl- Enterprise and the Milford system (see next Paragraph). This is needed due to progress on developments in farmed areas that have been replaced by both new housing and industrial development. This has occurred over the last 10-15 years. The result is development has consumed farmland with no net decrease in the acreage shown on the WR or on the AF for distribution accounting.

Next step would be to regulate and bill assessments based on Acreage watered. However the mapping effort would be needed to accomplish this, along with spreadsheet tracking of the associated Water Rights for each irrigated parcel. No small task to accomplish this, however the Cedar City Regional office indicated that they were initiating this effort soon, at the 2011 annual meeting.